How Dulles Reacted When Hitler Wrecked Locarno, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. 2, NUMBER 24 JULY 5, 1954 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why Churchill Talks Like Henry Wallace

The huge and garish Presidential Room at the Statler was jammed. The Marine Band, in red coats and white trousers, added to the din with the kind of music one hears at the circus. There was the excitement of a super gladiatorial event: Sir Winston had agreed (or seemed to have agreed) to take on questions from all comers, no holds barred. Mrs. Trollope would have been charmed with the scene and rushed home to add a new chapter to the Manners and Customs of the Americans. The block long dais was crowded with the cream of the press corps, i.e. its leading trained seals, whited sepulchres, and housebroken oracles. There was (or seemed to be) one Negro on the dais, though the National Press Club is still Jim Crow, but he turned out to be the Ambassador from Ceylon, and thus by protocol lily-white.

Sir Winston, with that big cigar, looking more and more like the late W. C. Fields, brought the house down when he appeared, followed by Anthony Eden, who had the pleased and incredulous look of a small boy allowed to go along and watch a gifted grandpa do card tricks. Churchill was magnificent. I never expect in my lifetime to hear and see a greater man. Beyond the puckishness and the hamming, there came through with tremendous sincerity the last, desperate effort of a noble old man to stem the tide toward war. His plea for "a good hard try" at peace and co-existence could not have been spoken in a more unfavorable context; such talk has long been regarded here as subversive. The atmosphere was vividly indicated for all time when Churchill felt it necessary to assure his audience that he was not a Communist! I blush for my country.

Why does Churchill now speak the language we used to hear from Henry Wallace? The basic pattern is the familiar one of balance-of-power politics. After the war, a Russo-American settlement would not have been to Britain's interest. The two giants would have divided the world over London's head. Funds for reconstruction in Britain could only be obtained from Congress by anti-Communist scare and alarm. More recently, as the value of American aid has fallen, its risks have risen. British recovery has made greater independence possible; the threat of losing more British spheres of influence to the U.S. (as in Iran) has made greater independence necessary. An H-bomb war would ruin Britain.

At the same time, tension between Moscow and Washington makes possible a profitable mediatorial role for London, especially in the China trade. Churchill's passion is Britain, not anti-Communism. He sees a chance to get the best of both worlds for his country. He sees its desolate end in a new war. He is also, with a seer's vision and a poet's tongue, anxious at death's door for one last exploit in the service of humanity. His has been an unquenchable thirst for glorious achievement. But how FDR would have been surprised and pleased at Cousin Winston's change of tune!

The Meaning of Locarno: Eden, Dulles and Munich

Eden was introduced to the audience as the man who resigned rather than acquiesce in Munich. To that audience it seemed an implied rebuke; was he not now engaged in a new chapter in appeasement in the Far East? Eden and Churchill represent conservatives who were not prepared to make their peace with Hitler; Dulles (as can be seen on page 3) represents the conservatives who were not only for appeasing the Axis, but applauded its aims. Like so many of those now in positions of power in this country, Dulles was then pro-Munich, pro-German, anti-British. (He still is). Churchill's earlier pro-Fascism, like his recent anti-Communism, stopped where British interests and the balance of power were endangered.

The difference between the two sets of men now is this. The British see a Far Eastern Locarno as a means of stabilizing the situation and saving Malaya. The Dulles crowd does not want the situation stabilized. A Locarno means recognition of Peking, the abandonment of Chiang Kai-shek and the ultimate restoration of Formosa to China. The void in the White House and the cowardice elsewhere have made this American policy. But this policy is being destroyed by a veritable revolution in world affairs signalized by Churchill's shift, the fall of the Catholics from control of foreign policy in Paris, the triumphal appearance of Chou En-lai on the world stage. The Nehru-Chou meeting dramatizes the liberation of Asia and the colored races from four centuries of white domination. The axis of world power is shifting fundamentally; the process can only be stopped if America, like a blinded Samson, brings down the whole house of humanity in common ruins. The U.S. is being pushed screaming, but inexorably, toward co-existence.

Toward A New Colonialism of Our Own

The process will take time, and will be turbulent. The possibility of war through misstep, miscalculation or just plain mischief will never be absent. The next stage may be a West European revolt against a new colonialism—the colonialism represented by American air bases in England and France. Ever since the Dulles "massive retaliation" speech, London and Paris have been haunted by the fear that one day, without consulting them, the U.S. might plunge into an atomic war which would bring immediate strikes by Russia at West European air bases. So long as the bases are there, whether used in the first attack or not, England and France are fatally at the mercy of any American adventure. They

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot stay out of a Russo-American war even if they want to. This will become a more serious problem for them as, if and when the steady deterioration of American government and opinion brings closer to full power a combination of the military, the China Lobby Senators and the crypto-Fascists like McCarthy.

The pattern of events in Iraq and Syria may repeat themselves in this new context. Just as the British and French established bases in these colonial countries as allies against dometic revolt and foreign attack, and stayed on to dominate their political life, until they were forced out, so the U.S. came to Western Europe as an ally but may end up as an unwelcome guest. What if a new American government uses these bases to interfere in internal politics, or refuses to relinquish the bases, standing on "contractual rights" as Britain and France have in Egypt and Morocco?

This will not sound as fantastic a few years hence as it may now. A deepening of xenophobia, a mood of bitterness, and an intensification of the trend toward a closer society may be expected in the wake of a Far Eastern settlement. The wild men will use the loss of Indo-China against the conservative Eisenhower Republicans as the Republicans used "the loss of China" against the Democrats. An unfriendly attitude toward Western Europe, an orientation toward Japan and Germany, will be the trend. Remember that the wild men are pre-war American Firsters.

But bitterness against England and France is not limited to their ranks. During the debate in the Commons on June 23 after the Eden "Locarno" speech, a Mr. Donnelly, a Laborite from Pembroke, made a remark which will illuminate the difference in attitude on the two sides of the Atlantic. While praising Eden's work at Geneva, Donnelly said maintenance of the Anglo-American alliance "was vital because it gave us a chance to influence and guide the American government's policies." He said that "if broken the chance of preventing American policies doing irreparable damage to the world would be lost." There is bitterness here in the State Department if not the White House because the Anglo-American entente has worked in just this way.

Though there has been no agreement on the Far East, the British have succeeded again (as Attlee did at a crucial moment in the Korean war) in restraining the Americans from recklessness. This is what rankles in Dulles' grumbling about operating under a British veto which in turn may reflect a veto by Nehru. Dulles is accustomed to act unilaterally, and to get obedience—as he has been getting it in Latin America. In this unfortunately he faithfully reflects the dominant mood in Congress: if these foreigners won't go along with us on EDC or the Far East or Guatemala, we shut off the money . . .

After Guatemala, the Hemispheric Police State

With the success of the revolt staged by the U.S. in Guatemala and in the mood of "disillusion" with Europe, the "Fortress America" isolationists will join hands with those who would like us to retire into the Western Hemisphere and "cultivate our own garden." The real trouble with this metaphor is that the Western Hemisphere below the Rio Grande is a garden we regard as full of weeds, lesser and darker breeds we must flatter and control. They don't especially care for the gardener, but the masses are easily ruled by a few thousand armed men whose allegiance can be bought or manipulated as in Guatemala.

The Guatemalan counter-revolution carried out the new principle laid down by Dulles at Caracas—that we would intervene against internal "subversion" as well as foreign aggression. This implies a hemispheric police state, with inter American control of travel, the mail and thoughts to keep out the dangerous. It is all there in the recommendation at Caracas that member governments enact "measures to require disclosure" of the identity, activities and source of funds of persons "spreading" Communist propaganda and to control their movements. The tactic of the Un-American Activities Committee and the authority of the FBI must become hemispheric (the latter already is). As the Communists go underground, we must be prepared to screen the political life of Latin America to sift out hidden "subversion." This will, of course, make it easy to get rid of anyone who agitates against banana, copper or oil companies.

Oppenheimer and The Brain-Washing of U.S. Intellectuals

As the sun of freedom begins to rise elsewhere, it is setting here. For the cruel savagery of the Atomic Energy Commission verdict on Oppenheimer, one must go to the great Moscow trials where the Old Bolsheviks were entrapped in a spider web woven by the secret police. Brownell's attack on Harry White last winter, the Oppenheimer proceeding now, represent another stage in the adoption here of the Russian practice of rewriting history to defame the opposition, to terrorize critics, to impose total conformity and to brainwash the intellectuals.

Notice that the heart of the case against Oppenheimer is that he failed to cooperate fully with the secret police. This runs like a sinister thread through the majority opinions—the intellectuals must learn to obey their police masters, and to obey without question. The FBI is to be as sacred here as the NKVD in Russia.

We hope to discuss the Oppenheimer report in more detail later but would warn now against sentimental expectation of a revolt of scientists. Scientists, like most human beings, tend to follow the line of least resistance; personal comfort and safety outweigh moral and political considerations. The crucifixion of Oppenheimer will serve as a sensational warning to the younger men that they had better toe the mark and eschew social consciousness. The ideal scientist is to be, as indeed our engineers have long tended to be, a kind of more mobile though less dependable IBM machine. "Security" is to be the watchword and "security" is a watchword incompatible with a free society. Defeat abroad is turning us inward, and it is fitting historically that the Oppenheimer decision should come on the heels of Churchill's rebellion.

Bulletin on the Brownell Police State Bill

Now is the time, as they say in the typing classes, for all good men to come to the aid of those fighting to maintain a free America. The battle is not lost if only enough of us will rise up to fight it. Which brings us to the Brownell bills discussed in last week's issue—one to set up a gigantic blacklist for virtually all industry, barring the subversive from employment; the other giving the Attorney General power to seize and liquidate trade unions, other organizations and businesses he considers "Communist infiltrated." (We are to get the same treatment we are giving Guatemala.) The A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. joined in the protest against those bills last week. There is growing distrust and dislike of Brownell in Congress. The Senate Judiciary Committee is opening hearings on Thursday. Get your organization to make an appearance. The bills can still be blocked if there is enough pressure.

Hot-Weather Gremlins in last week's issue garbled a reference to Churchill and Eden both disliking Dulles, made it read that Churchill and Dulles both disliked Eden! Sorry.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Eden Balked at Munich, John Foster Advocated Appeasement

Dulles and Locarno: A Revealing Bit of History

The Locarno treaty of 1925 was a mutual guarantee of the Western frontiers as established at Versailles. Germany agreed not to invade France and Belgium. Britain and Italy agreed to come to the defense of the victim if either side struck at the other across the Rhine. In this treaty, Germany also promised not to violate Articles 42 and 43 of the Versailles Treaty.

These were the articles which sought to buttress the disarmament of Germany by providing for the demilitarization of the Rhineland. "In case Germany violates in any manner whatever the provisions of Articles 42 and 43," the Locarno pact said, "she shall be regarded as committing a hostile act against the Powers signatory . . . and as calculated to disturb the peace of the world."

Ten years later Hitler tore up the disarmament provision of the Versailles pact and reconstituted the German General Staff. When neither France nor Britain acted, it was clear that the Locarno settlement was dead. The following March Hitler formally repudiated Locarno and marched into the Rhineland.

These events were discussed by John Foster Dulles in an article called "The Road to Peace." It was published by the *Atlantic Monthly* in October, 1935, just seven months after Hitler put into effect his "Law for the Reconstruction of the National Defense Forces."

Not So Moral, Then

Today all Mr. Dulles's utterances are heavily larded with morality. But he did not then view the scene in moral terms. He set out on a quite different line of argument. He began by enumerating the treaties—the League Covenant, the Kellogg pact, the Locarno Treaty—with which the world after World War I sought to prevent war. He noted that "in the face of all this, we sense that we are inevitably moving on toward war."

"Faced by a situation which superficially seems so inexplicable," Mr. Dulles went on, we adopt the time-honored expedient of postulating a 'personal devil'. Hitler, Mussolini, and Japanese war lords in turn became the object of our suspicion."

This implies that the menace represented by these men was somehow unreal, a figment of the imagination. Mr. Dulles said, "We forget that isolated individuals [Fuehrer and Duce were just "isolated individuals"—IFS] could never prevail against world sentiment for peace, except as they are the instrumentalities of powerful underlying forces. It is these which we must identify and counteract . . ."

And what were these "powerful underlying forces" which had to be counteracted? "The true explanation of the imminence of war," Mr. Dulles continued, "lies in the inevitability of change and the fact that peace efforts have been misdirected toward the prevention of change."

The trouble with peace plans, Mr. Dulles wrote, is that they fail to take into account "the present lack of any adequate substitute for force as an inducement to change." If only—Mr. Dulles implied—France, Poland, Ethiopia, China could be induced to accept "change," force would not be necessary . . .

Peace Downright Selfish

"It is easy," Mr. Dulles said, warming up his theme, "to explain the confounding of peace with stability. Those whose lives fall in pleasant places contemplate with equanimity an indefinite continuation of their present state. 'Peace' means to them that they should be undisturbed. 'Aggression' becomes the capital international crime and 'security' the watchword. The popular demand for peace is thus capitalized by those who selfishly seek to have the world continue as it is."

"It is not mere coincidence," Mr. Dulles goes on, "that it is the presently favored nations—France, Great Britain and the United States—whose governments have been most active in devising plans for perpetual peace. If other countries like Germany, Italy and Japan," he continues suavely, "adhere only reluctantly if at all to such projects, it is not because these nations are inherently warlike or bloodthirsty. They too want peace, but they undoubtedly feel within themselves potentialities which are repressed and they desire to keep open the avenues of change."

The effect was to picture France, Great Britain and the United States as somehow in the wrong. Germany, Italy and Japan were not "inherently warlike or bloodthirsty." They just wanted "change."

It was in the light of these principles that Mr. Dulles surveyed existing treaties. The trouble with the Covenant of the League, he said, was that if observed "existing frontiers would be perpetuated for all time, save as one state freely ceded its territory to another." This was "both impracticable and undesirable." The Kellogg pact was "perhaps the most futile of all peace efforts" because "force is thereby forever renounced as an instrument of national policy."

China, Not Japan, Was At Fault

Mr. Dulles included in his criticism the Stimson doctrine of "nonrecognition of the fruits of aggression" as enunciated "with reference to the situation brought about by Japan in Manchuria." (Note the delicacy and tact of Mr. Dulles's phrasing.) He did not know "whether such changes as have been occurring in the Far East are warranted by the facts" but he thought it "at least conceivable that they reflect a logical and inevitable tendency." If so, Mr. Dulles went on, he saw no reason why they should be "held in suspense until that hypothetical date when China was prepared freely to acquiesce therein so that the change could no longer be treated as 'aggression'."

Rape might be defended the same way by saying that natural passion could not be held in suspense until that hypothetical date when the victim was prepared freely to acquiesce therein.

Mr. Dulles proceeded to contrast such ill-advised efforts to "stabilize the peace" (his quotation marks, of course) with other "events, not so labelled, which have perhaps been a more genuine contribution to peace." He begins with British renunciation of naval supremacy, and goes on to "the return to Germany of the Saar." The benefits of this to Franco-German relations, however, were "offset" by French insistence on German disarmament.

Here Mr. Dulles finally came—among these "genuine contributions to peace"—to what Hitler was doing, and this is how he phrased it. "Germany," Mr. Dulles said, "had become increasingly restless . . . The time had come to release her from the treaty limitations. This was not done, with the result that Germany, by unilateral action, has now taken back her freedom of action." That's all.

What of the Locarno Pact? Mr. Dulles disparaged it as "another instrument which seeks peace by perpetuating frontiers." But it at least had the virtue of being limited. "It relates only to boundaries between France, Belgium and Germany. Many changes can occur consistently with its terms, and the fact that the parties were willing to make so limited a compact was interpreted as implying the possibility of changes in other quarters. Thus, by indirection," Mr. Dulles concluded, "the Locarno Pact may have served the peace."

This veiled and subtle language requires some explanation. The Germans at Locarno refused to include their eastern frontiers in the system of mutual guarantees. Poland and Russia felt that Locarno was a menace because it left open the door to German aggression eastward, i.e. to pick up Mr. Dulles's language, it implied "the possibility of changes in other quarters." Then as now, Mr. Dulles was for "liberation." But it would be hard to match the lush cynicism of the double-talk with which he then served as apologist for appeasement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Case Against Paul Crouch

Is Brownell Afraid of Being "Hoist By His Own Perjurer"?

The extent to which the government has become enmeshed in the toils of its own informers may be seen in the briefs filed with the Board of Immigration Appeals last week in the case of Jacob Burck. "Jake" Burck of the Chicago *Sun-Times* is one of the country's most distinguished cartoonists, the recipient of many honors, including the Pulitzer Prize. He has been ordered deported to the Poland he left at the age of ten because two decades ago he was for a short time a member of the Communist party and a cartoonist for the *Daily Worker*.

Though a long list of distinguished men, including Bishop Sheil of Chicago, have come to his aid, Burck is in serious danger of banishment and separation from his American born wife and children. Unlike dozens of obscurer folk being put through the deportation mill on the grounds of present or past membership in the Communist Party, Burck has had the resources to counter-attack. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has a stable of ex-Communists employed as informers in deportation cases. The two produced against Burck were Paul Crouch and Maurice Malkin. Burck's lawyers have filed separate briefs analyzing the confusions, contradictions and perjuries in the past testimony of these hired witnesses.

The kind of men thus employed may be seen in the brief's thumb-nail biography of Malkin. "He entered Sing Sing upon conviction for a particularly brutal, felonious assault. By his own admission, he obtained citizenship fraudulently. He voted illegally for many years; is a perjurer by his own admission and the finding of a criminal court jury; and was discharged from the WPA on grounds of forgery, fraud and falsification of time sheets. By his own admissions subject to denaturalization and guilty of espionage, he continues a citizen and unprosecuted as he continues to testify."

In calmer times, the testimony of such witnesses would be rejected as tainted—not merely because they are paid to testify as they do, but because if they ever refused to testify they themselves would be in danger of prosecution and deportation. Pay and blackmail shadow their words.

This is neither the end nor the worst of the evil. As in other criminal enterprises, the tool can menace its master. This was demonstrated when Roy Cohn introduced in the McCarthy hearings a seven-page memorandum by Crouch on alleged infiltration of the armed forces by Communists. The man employed by Brownell to convict scores of the helpless turned up to supply ammunition for McCarthy's attack on the Eisenhower Administration.

The 27 affidavits attached to the Crouch brief in the Burck case provide a damning record of perjury by this professional informer. "I am amazed," Judge Holtzoff said in Federal District Court here after Crouch testified in the Weinberg case, "that the Immigration and Naturalization Service should employ him as a member of its staff." An honorable Attorney General would have fired Crouch and cleaned out that stable of informers long ago.

But the momentum of events has put Brownell and the government in a position where they can no longer shake loose from their hirelings. Among the cases studied in the Crouch brief are the two Steve Nelson trials in Pennsylvania, at least one Smith Act prosecution, several deportation actions, the Bridges trial and the government's registration proceeding against the Communist Party before the Subversive Activities Control Board. This windbag, this self-confessed cultivator of fantasy, has starred in all of them. To try Crouch now for perjury, even to drop him from the payroll without punishment, would admit that there was tainted testimony in all these proceedings.

The man who hires a killer soon fears for himself. So it is with the man who hires a liar. Crouch has powerful friends among those he has served in Congress. He testified for McCarthy in the Government Printing Office inquiry; for Eastland, in smearing the Durrs and Joseph Lash.

Who knows what Crouch might say about Brownell if Crouch were now to be cashiered? Who knows what stories he might furnish McCarthy? To paraphrase Gospel, one might say that those who take up perjury shall themselves perish by it.

Let Us Send A Sample Copy Free To Your Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name_____

Street_____

City_____ **Zone**_____ **State**_____

Enter this gift sub for $4 more (money enclosed):

(To) Name_____

Street_____

City_____ **Zone**_____ **State**_____

7-5-54

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S.E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED